DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 696 FL 026 472

AUTHOR Reynolds, Kate Mastruserio
TITLE ESL Learners' and Tutors' Expectations of Conversational Participation, Roles, and Responsibility.
PUB DATE 2000-10-19
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Communicative Competence (Languages); *English (Second Language); Graduate Students; Higher Education; Interviews; Participant Observation; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Sociolinguistics; *Student Participation; *Student Role; Triangulation; *Tutoring

ABSTRACT

This qualitative research study used the interactional sociolinguistics approach (Goffman, 1959; Gumperz, 1982) to analyze the expectations of learners and tutors participating in the English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) Drop-in-Center (DIC) environment. Analysis focused on the learners' and tutors' expectations of the conversation and participation roles that greatly influenced participation within the DIC. Informants in the study included five students in a Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) master's degree program and 48 ESL students from diverse ethnic and educational backgrounds. Data were triangulated through participant observations, field notes, interviews, documents, and video/audio-taped sessions. Data indicated that there was a crucial gap between tutor and student expectations for participation within the DIC conversations. This conflict influenced the second language acquisition of the students by shaping communication and opportunities for participation in the DIC environment. Pedagogical suggestions are included in the conclusions. Scholarly references appear throughout the text. (Contains 26 references.) (Author/KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 447 696

Running head: Conversational Expectations

ESL Learners' and Tutors' Expectations of Conversational Participation, Roles, and Responsibility.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Kate Mastruserio Reynolds

By:

Dr. Kate Mastruserio Reynolds

Southern Connecticut State University

October 19, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The ESL Drop-in-Center (DIC) was an obligatory component of a university ESL program. Outside of the ESL classrooms, students would return to their L1 cultural niches where they speak no English (Jenkins, 1995). The DIC was founded in an attempt to create a forum for ESL students to converse informally in English. Students attended the DIC for one hour a week for opportunities to use their English conversation skills outside of the classroom and ultimately to advance the development of communicative competence (Savignon, 1983). The DIC context appeared to minimize a major concern in ESL education, that is the integration of the ESL student population into the "real-world" context by providing a "testing ground" for the use and development of language skills within a protected, non-threatening milieu (Brown, 1987).

This qualitative research study used the Interactional Sociolinguistics approach (Goffman, 1959; Gumperz, 1982) to analyzing the expectations of learners and tutors of participation in the ESL DIC environment (Tannen, 1993). Analysis focused on the learners' and tutors' expectations of the conversation and participation roles that greatly influenced participation within the DIC. Informants in this research study included five graduate students in the TESL program, and forty-eight ESL students from diverse ethnic origins and educational backgrounds. Data was triangulated through participant observations, field-notes, interviews, documents, and video/audio-taped sessions.

The data indicated that there was a crucial gap between tutor and students expectations for participation within the DIC conversations. This conflict affected the second language acquisition of these university students by shaping communication and options for participation DIC environment.

INTRODUCTION

Faced with the dilemma of international students in a university campus environment who lacked opportunities to meet native speakers or converse in English, a large Midwestern university (MU) Center for ESL/TESL instituted a conversation exchange component to their international teaching assistant ESL program. The center developed from the foundation of an existing conversation exchange program which had become unwieldy and difficult to staff. The initial concept was formulated based on the community of students at MU who were experiencing difficulty communicating with others outside of their own cultural niche (Jenkins, 1995). In other words, the students would speak their native languages on campus within their own ethnic group. Thus, when they needed to interact in English, they would lack in accuracy and automaticity (Bialystok, 1978).

This conversation/tutorial environment was named the ESL Drop-in-Center (D.I.C.) so that students would feel comfortable visiting the center at times that were most convenient for them. Importantly, the Drop-in-Center was not a formal classroom type of environment; rather it was completely open-format. The tutors did no advance formal preparation; there were no grades, homework, tests, or quizzes.

The D.I.C. was utilized as an obligatory component of the ESL Conversation Management, Oral Presentation Skills, Improving Pronunciation, and Speaking and Listening Skills courses. Students enrolled in these courses are required to attend the D.I.C. for a minimum of one hour weekly. Their D.I.C. attendance constituted 10-15% of their ESL class grade.

Activities that occurred within the Drop-in-Center ranged from slightly tutorial-based tasks to small-talk type conversation. For example, students could receive assistance in speaking/listening (e.g., pronunciation and presenting), and in reading/writing (e.g. brainstorming, outlining, clustering, free writing, writing literature reviews). However, conversation was by far the most prevalent activity. Topics included cultural issues, controversial issues, and discussing personal problems and questions such as landlord and telephone company problems as well as how to get a free email account. Personal oral narratives/anecdotes were particularly favored activities.

Tutors were instructed in their Methods courses and Practica to follow communicative goals in the D.I.C. The goals that were most important for the tutors were 1) to encourage a student-centered environment, 2) to elicit and address ESL learners' questions, concerns, and topics, 3) to promote meaningful discussion, 4) to reduce learners' anxiety and build a comfortable environment, and 5) to have pleasurable experience, and learn through discussion with the learners.

Thus, considering the background of this language learning center and the goals that the staff strives to attain, it is necessary to understand how the students approach this environment. Through an understanding the students' frames of expectation for verbal interaction and participation light would be shed on the center's effectiveness as perceived by the student population. Therefore, the purpose of this qualitative research study was to analyze English as a Second Language learners' perspectives and frames of expectations for verbal interaction and participation in this conversational environment. This discussion will focus on answering these questions: What are learners' and tutors' expectations of each other in this conversation exchange environment? How do learners' expectations influence their participation in the environment? How do conflicts arising from any incongruent expectations between tutor/teacher and students impact their conversations?

The significance of this study lies in better understanding our ESL learners. A common concern for ESL programs at American universities is why international graduate students from China, Japan, and Korea are so quiet in English class. These graduate students' TOEFL scores are usually extremely high (Jenkins, in press). Specifically, they are in the 600 range for TOEFL, yet many experience tremendous difficulties in speaking in a conversational manner or passing oral English proficiency tests. Instructors are frequently baffled by the conflict between the learners' expressed wishes for additional opportunities to interact with native speakers of English and the students' lack of participation in interactional events when these opportunities present themselves (Jenkins, in press). ESL conversational classrooms and support services like the D.I.C. present ESL learners with these opportunities to converse. This study is an attempt to better understand the learners' and tutors' perceptions of the efficacy of this conversational opportunity.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A great deal of anecdotal evidence exists on the topic of ESL students' expectations of roles in the American second language classroom, however, there has been little research conducted solely on this topic. This literature review will describe studies conducted on the subject of ESL students' role expectations.

In 1993, McCargar conducted a study focused on the expectations of English as a second language students and teachers. The results indicated that ESL students expected a more teacher-centered learning environment than the American teachers preferred. These results were attributed to significant cultural differences about role expectations in the classroom. This study is significant to the discussion at hand, because it reveals ESL students' cultural expectations of the role of the teacher in the classroom.

Working with native-American children, Philips (1983) conducted a seminal research study which found that native-American children participate according to the cultural norms of their home community as opposed to the norms of the majority community which governs school norms. Therefore, given that the native-American children were participating in school in ways that reflected appropriate behavior in their home culture, there is a need to determine if non-native speakers of English studying in the U.S. also bring their home culture patterns and behavior into the ESL classroom.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This qualitative research study used the Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) approach to analyzing the expectations of learners and tutors of participation in the ESL DIC environment (Goffman, 1959, Gumperz, 1982). IS can be defined as the study of the culturally-based, linguistic and social construction of interaction, and is concerned with interlocutors' perspectives of interaction. IS involves both theoretical and methodological aspects toward analyzing discourse. According to Gumperz (1982), the tenets of IS are include contextual presuppositions, or background knowledge, that interlocutors bring to a speaking event. Contextualization cues, are the indicators (verbal and non-verbal) within the environment during social interaction of meaning. They relate what is said to contextual presuppositions, which allows for situated inferences about the speaker's intended meaning (e.g. illocutionary force). Situated inferences

are the interlocutors' inferences based in a given speaking event. Finally, face is the social value a person claims for him/herself by the position others assume he/she has taken during an interaction (Goffman, 1959).

Another theory that informs this study is Frame Theory by Tannen (1993) and Goffman (1974). Goffman's (1959, 1974) frame theory and Tannen's (1993) frame analysis theory can essentially be described as the participants' interpretations of a scene or situation which causes them to form schema for the language that they employ during that event. For example, when an individual needs to go to the bank, she may organize her thoughts in advance and practice the language that she will use when she arrives there. She would draw upon her previously formed banking schema to know what and how to make her request. Her banking schema creates a frame of expectations for linguistic and non-linguistic behavior in that environment. Throughout her time at the bank, she will repeatedly draw upon, inform, and re-design her banking schema and frame of expectation.

The ways in which the theoretical constructs of Interactional Sociolinguistics and Frame Analysis Theory interact are that they share the concept of background knowledge influencing the views of participants in a speaking event. IS's contextual presuppositions and an individual's frame of an event are similar in that in both these concepts relate the individual's prior knowledge to their viewpoint and interpretation of a speaking event. One difference though is that frame analysis theory clearly links the individual's cultural background knowledge to his/her viewpoint and interpretation of an event. Therefore, these two theoretical concepts will be jointly utilized to explain the findings of participants' perspectives in the D.I.C. environment.

METHODOLOGY

Setting

The setting of this study was in a midwestern university at which there was an academic ESL program. At this university, there were approximately 1700 international students, with the majority coming from China and India. In the ESL program, an English discussion center (D.I.C) enabled ESL students to go there to practice their speaking, listening, reading or writing skills. Mainly, though, the

ESL students and a teaching English as a second language (TESL) tutor would discuss topics of interest to the students. The ESL students who attended the center usually visited because it was an ESL course requirement. It was in this center that data was collected for this study. The informants self-selected their participation in this study, and all participants regularly visited the center once a week for the nine-week quarter.

The center was a small room about 12 feet by 20 feet long. In the center of the room, there were three rectangular tables shaped in a "U" pattern, and chairs that surrounded them. There was a TV/VCR, a marker board on the wall near the door, a cork-board displaying miscellaneous papers and announcements, numerous file cabinets, and coffee making supplies. The audiotape recorders were set up in the center of two of the tables where the ESL participants in this study sat regularly.

Participants

Two different populations participated in this study. The first group was the ESL international teaching assistants, and the second group was there tutors in the Drop-in-Center.

The ESL informants volunteered to participate after they were randomly sampled from their D.I.C. attendance records. Importantly, informed consent was requested and obtained for all participants. In order to acquire a holistic perspective, additional ESL informants were chosen through maximum variation and intensity sampling (Patton, 1990, p. 182), and included students from many different nationalities. Those observed and interviewed were 19 international graduate students participants from China, Thailand, Korea, Taiwan, Egypt, Latvia, Romania, and Venezuela. This mixed-gender group's ages ranged from 24 to 36. This group's demographic make-up represented the range of individuals who attended the center.

Regarding the D.I.C. tutors, there were eight D.I.C. tutors, aged 25-32, who chose to participate and adequately epitomized the demography of the tutors in the environment. There were five Americans, a Turk, a Chinese, and a Colombian who were sampled according to maximum variation and typical case sampling. (Patton, 1990, p. 182).

Data Collection

Observations of the D.I.C. sessions were conducted for 14 weeks. During this period, observation field notes and interaction maps, audiotapes, and videotapes were collected that exemplified the typical events that occurred in the D.I.C. Open-ended questionnaires were also distributed and completed by the ESL ITA informants. Based on these observations, interviews arranged with ESL ITA and tutor informants.

During the tutor interviews, videotapes and audiotapes were played excerpts of D.I.C. activity in which they were engaged, and the tutors asked their perspectives on students' preferences and their expectations of student participation. This procedure is delineated in Interactional Sociolinguistics as a manner in which the multiple participants in a speaking event may explain their perspectives, so that the researcher is not the interpreter of the occurrences (Gumperz, 1982; Shiffrin, 1994).

During ESL student interviews, they were asked about their expectations of involvement in the D.I.C., their expectations of the tutor, and influences on their verbal participation. For example, "What does a good tutor do? What activities do you prefer? What do you expect to do when you visit the D.I.C.? What do you like the most?" Following Interactional Sociolinguistic research methodology, these informants were shown video clips and had segments of audiotape played of their participation. They were urged to determine what factors influenced their participation (Gumperz, 1982) as well as their expectations their role and that of the tutor.

Data Set

The data gathered include observation field notes (including interaction maps), observation audiotapes and videotapes, open-ended questionnaires, and tutor and ESL student interview notes, and audiotapes.

Type of Data	**Quantity**
Observation field notes	236 pages
Interaction maps	28 maps
Audio Recordings	331 pages

Video Recordings	379 pages
5 tutor interviews	97 pages
19 student interviews	252 pages
Open-ended student surveys	29 surveys

Coding Techniques

A text-base manager, FolioVIEWS 3.11.2 (1994) (see Miles & Huberman, 1994), was used to code data. Once the data was collected and transcribed, it was input into FolioVIEWS (1994), and was read and re-read. Content analysis (Berg,1995, Patton, 1990, p. 381-383) was used to enable the common themes to emerge from the data. Once the categories were established, the data were again coded using open coding methods (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, pp.181-187).

From the coded data, categories related to the tutors' and learners' perspectives on the students' participation emerged. For example, categories were topic initiation, conversation leadership expectations, selection of speaker, regulation of turns at talk, students' preferences, tutor's preferences, responsibility for participation, and influences on student participation.

Triangulation of Data

Data triangulation was achieved through the multiple data sources (e.g., audio, videotape data, researchers' field notes, and informant interviews).

FINDINGS

There are two areas in which the ESL students' and TESL tutors' role expectations for participation conflicted 1) topic initiation, 2) conversation leadership. These two major findings will be presented with supporting data from all data sources.

Finding One

ESL students and TESL tutors had differing opinions and preferences as to whom should initiate topics for discussion. Tutors preferred student generated topics, because they thought that student initiated topics would bring about more meaningful conversation and motivate the students to participate

while simultaneously reducing the amount of their own speaking. Whereas ESL students preferred that tutors to initiate topics or to bring pre-prepared topics to the D.I.C. conversation sessions. They believed it was the tutor's role to be prepared, like in a traditional classroom, and to identify topics of interest to everyone in attendance. For instance, in one interview, an American male tutor explained that the results of the students' reliance on the tutor generated topics.

Example 1: Tutor opinion of topic initiation.

Researcher: "Do they rely on you for the topic or direction?"

Josh: "They have been in the past, and what I've found is that I end up speaking more, but what I'm trying to do more is actively lower the ratio of my talk to their talk to to a um so that they're carrying the conversation between between 60-80% of the time. With me merely asking questions that open up the discussion further and I was relatively successful today doing that, with one of my um students, this is um um it's because of his um, because of his commitment to it, it's easier. With some some of the um students they clam up."

It is evident that the tutor clearly saw a reliance by the ESL students on him as the topic generator, and he seemed to be actively trying to remove himself from that role. He also indicated that his strategy for removing himself as the topic generator was to ask questions that elicited students' input. Another example of this viewpoint came from an interview with a Chinese female student who explained what a good D.I.C. tutor should do.

Example 2: Students' perspectives of a good tutor.

Ting: "I think that the good tutor has the power."

Researcher: "Power?" (laughs)

Ting: "That means, make everybody active, make speak, like speak. Feel free. And another thing is can lead to some topic. Give some topic, then change it when it is done, and give another topic. That is a good tutor."

It is clear that Ting's perspective of a good tutor is one who provides the topics and manages the resulting conversation. Of the ESL students interviewed and who completed the questionnaire, 82% indicated that it

was the tutor's role in the environment to choose topics that would "catch the attention" of the all of the students in attendance at the D.I.C. at any given time.

This subtle conflict between the expectations of the tutor's role and responsibilities by both populations stems from their beliefs of the others' role and responsibilities. Since the tutors were looking for a more communicative, and meaningful small-talk-type conversation, they thought that it would be best for the learners' to identify their own topics of interests. Whereas the ESL students expected the D.I.C. tutor to perform the role of a traditional teacher who prepares lessons (i.e., topics in this case), and is responsible for engaging all the students.

Other examples of the students' perspectives toward topic initiation come from the open-ended questionnaires and ESL student interviews.

Examples 3-10: Students' perspectives toward topics.

> "I prefer when the tutor have the topic..."
>
> "If the topics are not appealing, then I won't open my mouth."
>
> "Depends on the topic, if I know about it then I talk, if not, I listen."
>
> "Topic. I can't squeeze even a word if there's a ongoing topic could not cause my attention."
>
> "Everyone can drop in and talk freely, but the students with poor English can't improve English yet. Because the chance for them is still few…but I think it should has a host in center for giving topics."
>
> "Sometime, tutor pick a topic and everyone talk one by one, take turns, take turns yea, and that help."
>
> "I mean, every person has different personalities, some person is open mind he keep on talking, (laughs), and you not even notice it, yea, you you I think the tutor can use smart ways to change the topic to something everyone likes."

From the previous comments of D.I.C. students, it is apparent that the students do not feel responsible for topic initiation. They seem to take a passive role in topicalization, and view this as part of

the tutor's job/role. Therefore, it is clear that the ESL students' and TESL tutors' belief systems and expectations conflict over the concept of conversational topic initiation.

Finding Two

The second finding was a conflict over the leadership of the conversations. In this section, the role expectations of conversational leadership and the expectations of equality and regulations of turns-at-talk will be discussed.

Students preferred a tutor-led conversation while the tutors were actively trying to remove themselves from the conversation (see example 1). Tutors, on the other hand, were aspiring toward a students-controlled conversation. For example, one American female TESL tutor indicated in an interview that she did not want to be the leader of the conversation. Additionally, she thought that the ESL students would learn how to participate in a real conversation through doing it in the D.I.C. without the leadership of the tutor.

Example 11: Tutor view of conversation leadership.

Tutor: One of the students, he makes fun of me because I'm always asking phony questions like what's your major, or where are you from, and which isn't really a a relaxed conversation, it's sort of me directing.

Researcher: Do you like directing the conversation?

Tutor: Well::, actually, no. Um, I would prefer to uh that the students would just talk. Ya know, we are told uh in our classes that if the students can talk like in real-life conversation that they will uh develop their conversation abilities.

Another piece of evidence of students' expectations of conversational leadership by the tutor came from the field notes.

Example 12: Tutor conversation leadership responsibilities.

Field Notes: Tutor is asking questions when the conversation stalls. Students are sitting quietly. Several are looking down at their hands, at magazines, or at the tutor.

In this excerpt, it can be seen that the tutor is ultimately responsible for directing the conversations particularly when the conversation stalls, and that they employ the strategy of questioning to jump start the conversation. The ESL students were not the individuals who would take the floor to do this, they simply remained silent.

The students' perspectives of the leadership of the conversation were more difficult to elicit, because they were tacit for the learners. ESL learners were able to articulate that they did not see themselves in the role of conversational leader only through their viewpoint on the role of the tutor. ESL students were unconscious of the tutor's conversational expectations of them. They expected the tutor to be the conversational leader, and in going so the tutor would equalize the amount of individual student speaking and regulate all the students' turns at talk. They perceived the tutor as more like a teacher than a conversational exchange partner. The following examples of these beliefs come from ESL student interviews.

Examples12-19: Students' expectations of the tutors' conversational leadership responsibilities.

Example 12

"Yea, take turns, I think in D.I.C. they [tutors] should get get every every person participate in this activities, if he is just sitting and just listening, but sometimes just two persons just talking, other persons sit together without say nothing. It's not good, I think."

Example 13

"Yea, I think in D.I.C., it should be informal certainly but it this should have some organization. Tutors should control the whole process, you can not just let it go, every person just talk talk talk, they must have some topics, and then change to other topics, there are books, and they should have some organizations. They should help make no one talk too much."

Example14

R "So should the tutor direct conversation to each student?"

G "I think."

Example 15

R "Okay, so you think that the tutor should be sort of a conversation traffic cop?" (laughs)

DH "Yes. That is important."

Example 16

"...the tutor will use that one for for a topic. Trying to involve all all the students in the discussion."

Example 17

"Characteristics of a good tutor is uh someone who makes you speak a lot." (laughs)

Example 18

"And in encourage everybody, especially somebody who has oral English, has some trouble. To encourage them to speak."

Example 19

"Yes, shyness or talkativeness do make difference in the participation shy people do not speak much but the person in charge of the center really make shy people to speak."

It is clear that the ESL students preferred that the tutor select next speaker and regulate the conversational input of all participants in the discussion. They expected that the role of the tutor was to lead the conversation, make opportunities for all students to participate, to equalize the amount of student speech, and to elicit speech from the more reticent. They were looking for an environment where there was more fairness in talk, so that everyone had chances to contribute. Contributions may have been difficult for some learners due to the natural speed of the conversations or the number of participants present in the D.I.C. at any given time.

The tutors, on the other hand, had differing expectations of their role and the students' roles in the conversation. The tutors did not expect to direct the conversation, or to select the next speaker. They preferred the conversation to be like natural conversation, which is unregulated and sometimes unfair in individual amount of talk and floor holding. An example of this came from an interview with a Colombian female tutor

Example 20: Tutor beliefs of turn regulation.

Tutor: "Yea, it would be great to get everyone to participate without having to direct the conversation at more quiet students. It it uh would be much more natural then."

Researcher: "How would you prefer to have the conversation go?"

Tutor: "It would be best if the students would just talk and and take turns like in real-life. It is very uh fake when they uh say something and look at me, then I say something, and another person takes a turn and so on."

Researcher: "Would you prefer not to be involved in the conversation?"

Tutor: "No, no, it's not that. I just want it to be more more realistic, not artificial."

Researcher: "Do you think that you should regulate the conversation in any manner?"

Tutor: "No, I think that I should uh be a participant in the conversation and model appropriate expressions, and grammar, etc. that's all."

As this quote illustrates, the tutors expected students to self-select and participate in a real-life conversation. They did not consider that fact that natural conversation is unregulated and sometimes unfair in individual amount of talk and floor holding. They did not see it as there responsibility to regulate the amount of talk.

DISCUSSION

"Expectations about educational roles that participants bring to the classroom influence not only their views of the class, but also their willingness to participate in different kinds of learning activities" (McGoarty, 1993, p. 1).

In this discussion section, I will first summarize the ESL students' and TESL tutors' preference for participation in the D.I.C. environment. Students preferred tutor generated topics, a tutor-led conversation in which the tutor served as a conversation traffic cop. They favored the tutor to control the amount of turns and floor holding for all the students. Finally, they endorsed a more structured environment regulated by the tutor similar to classroom-like discourse.

Since the tutors were being trained in their Masters TESOL program to conform to the

Communicative Language Teaching Approach, they felt obligated to elicit student generated topics and facilitate student-owned conversation. They wished to be somewhat removed from the conversation in order to better expedite student output. The environment the tutors were trying to create was to be learner-centered with relatively unstructured sessions, and natural, authentic, and casual conversation.

This situation caused conflict between the tutors' and the students' participation expectations, so conversation broke down intermittently. The conversation breakdown is typified by a frequent lack of students verbal participation, tutor domination of the conversation, and instances of long, awkward silences. Ultimately, these differences in expectations of the roles in the Drop-in-Center environment caused the learners and the tutors to leave the environment with feelings of confusion, frustration, or lack of language development.

Importantly, neither the tutors, administrators of the D.I.C. nor the ESL program articulated their expectations of ESL students' participation in the environment. Perhaps this lack of communication could be attributed to the emerging nature of the environment. Because it was newly designed with general goals for real communication, it was not fully considered that the ESL students would view this environment as a classroom-like setting. Without parameter setting by the stakeholders in the environment, the ESL students naturally defaulted to their previously conceived frames of expectations (Tannen, 1993) of the classroom environment until they became more accustomed to the new set of expectations in the D.I.C. setting. Their default expectations would be based on their previous classroom experiences, and for most of these international teaching assistants, their classroom experiences were in their home cultures (Philips, 1983).

The significance of this study lies in the fact that there were conflicts between tutor and learner expectations of verbal interaction in this informal conversational context. These conflicts could have been avoided with communication of the expectations of both groups, so that a negotiated set of participation expectations could have been utilized. A sharing of expectations would have allowed both parties to feel more at ease and more empowered in their role in the D.I.C.

These findings can also be extended to the formal, classroom context. These conflicts in

expectations arose from culturally-bound views on the structure of classrooms (Tannen, 1993), as well as participation and interaction in the classroom, ultimately causing some learners to become alienated and disenfranchised (Philips, 1983). For example, Weaver (1995) believed that this lack of verbal participation is due to unfamiliarity with the ESL teaching approaches employed in the United States, because many Asian graduate students' educational backgrounds in EFL have been with the Grammar Translation or Audio-Lingual approaches (Zhiming, 1987; Lasley, 1998).

The communicative approach has been a significantly influential approach to language teaching in ESL in the United States since the 1980's, although it is only just becoming used in Asian EFL classrooms. This approach frequently seems a little bewildering to the typical Asian student, because it is different from their past language learning experiences. It has been suggested that it not always effective for Chinese students (Ellis, 1996). Clearly, a better understanding of students' culturally-based expectations of teachers would inform current ESL pedagogy.

PEDAGOGICAL SUGGESTIONS

Pedagogical suggestions for eliminating conflicts that arise from incongruent expectations include tutor and teacher training, and student introduction and orientation. Orientation toward facilitating discussion as opposed to leading it.

Suggestions for tutor training for a Drop-in-Center- like environment include 1) topic preparedness in the event that the students prefer the tutor to initiate the topic. Longer wait time so that the learners have the time to contribute an utterance. Many learners at the novice to intermediate levels feel that the nature speed of conversation prohibits contributions particularly when the native speaker feels uncomfortable with silence. Finally, if the tutor would select the next speaker when in a heated conversation, this would include more reticent speakers. Tutor elicitation of more quiet students' opinions may provide the opportunity the students need in order to participate, if the tutor can do this without raising the affective filter (Krashen, 1981a, 198b, 1982) of the learners.

Recommendations to improve the experience for the learners include student introduction and orientation to the unfamiliar, D.I.C. environment which should include some discussion of what they

think should occur there and what they think will help them develop their second language abilities. Culturally sensitive or responsive "expectation" training would also help, because they may better understand the goals of the situation or teacher/tutor.

Finally, if these findings are applied to the classroom environment, then teacher training should be altered to include knowledge of the students' culturally-based expectations about what the classroom should look like. Information about participant structures (Philips, 1983) and training would help new teachers to better understand the nature of participation in the ESL classroom.

REFERENCES

Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. Language Learning, 28: 69-83.

Berg, B. L. (1995). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, H. D. (1994). Principles of language learning and teaching, 3rd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Ellis, G. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? ELT Journal, 50 (3): 213-218.

FolioVIEWS 3.11.2 [Computer software]. (1994). Provo, UT: Folio Corp.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Gumperz, J. (1982). Discourse strategies. New York, NY: Cambridge U P.

Jenkins, S. (in press). Cultural and linguistic miscues: A case study of international teaching assistants and academic faculty miscommunication. International Journal of Intercultural Relations.

Jenkins, S. (1995). Strategies for ITA "language immersion" programs: Responding to the concerns of the discipline. In T. A. Heenan & K. F. Jerich (Eds.), Teaching graduate students to teach: Engaging the disciplines. Proceedings of the Fourth National Conference on the Training and Employment of Graduate Teaching Assistants. Urbana-Champaign, IL: U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Krashen, S. (1981a). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1981b). The "fundamentals pedagogical principle" in second language teaching. Studia Linguistica, 35: 50-70.

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lasley, G. Background information for ESL/EFL teachers of Chinese students, China File [TESL-L listserv]. (1998). New York, NY: CUNY [LISTSERV@CUNYVN.CUNY.EDU].

McCargar, D. F. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. Modern Language Journal, 77 (2): 192-207.

McGroarty, M. (1993). Cross-cultural issues in Adult ESL literacy classrooms. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358751)

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Philips, S. U. (1983). The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian reservation. New York, NY: Longman.

Savignon, S. J (1983). Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). Approaches to discourse. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tannen, D. (1993). Framing in discourse. New York, NY: Oxford.

Weaver, G. R. (1995). Communication and conflict in the multicultural classroom. Adult Learning, 6, 23-24.

Zhiming, H. (1987, June). English teaching in China: Problems and perspectives. TESOL Newsletter, 21(3): 25-27.